

REMARKS

Claims 1-23 are pending in the present application. Claims 1-3, 7-11, 14-16, 19-21, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102, and claims 4-6, 12, 13, 17, 18, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103. Claims 1, 8, 14, and 19 are amended. No new matter is added. The rejections are respectfully traversed in light of the following remarks, and reconsideration is requested.

MacPHERSON, KWOK CHEN
A HEID LLP
1702 TECHNOLOGY DRIVE
SUITE 226
SAN JOSE, CA 95110
(408) 752-7049
FAX (408) 382-9262

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-3, 7-11, 14-16, 19-21, and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Nguyen et al. (US 6,490,051). In rejecting independent claims 1, 8, 14, and 19, the Examiner cites, in relevant part, to Nguyen at column 8, line 46 to column 9, line 40. Nguyen, in Fig. 4, discloses a printer system that receives glyph handle and/or Unicode character identification information from a graphics device interface 130. (col. 8, lines 62-65). If the glyph is supported, the system gets a symbol set from the glyph translation table (GTT) map table and obtains that glyph's character code, which allows a proper selection of the printer resident font character to be printed by the printer. (col. 9, lines 1-14). The character code is then sent to the printer to be printed. (col. 9, lines 13-15). For characters not supported, the printer driver draws the glyph as a bitmap image to be printed. (col. 9, lines 25-32). Thus, Nguyen discloses a system that uses character codes in a map table to print supported glyphs, which enables the system to not always print bitmap images. (col. 9, lines 31-40). In other words, the system of Nguyen is for supplying character codes for different fonts to be printed. Furthermore, Nguyen discloses that the system uses "predefined glyph conversions" (col. 17, lines 22-25), with new fonts or glyphs handled by modifying sub-modules.

To the contrary, claim 1, as amended, recites "a dynamically user-created character substitution table for substituting a portion of said program that is not compatible with said printer, wherein the program can include both printable characters and print commands". Support for the amendment is found in Applicants' specification at page 15, lines 8-22, page 17, line 1 to page 18, line 7, page 19, lines 5-25, and page 20, lines 23-26. Thus, no new matter is added. As detailed in Applicants' specification, the printer system of Applicant's invention enables both characters and commands to be changed, deleted, or otherwise modified. Nguyen teaches a printer system in which only the glyphs are replaced.

Furthermore, a user creates the character substitution table, such as using a CST editor in a printer manager system. The user can decide on which actions and/or items to be deleted or replace and can also edit the table as desired. Nguyen teaches a printer system in which the system supported glyphs are pre-established. As a result, Applicants' printer system is different than the one disclosed in Nguyen, both in structure and operation. In particular, Applicant's system has a higher capability and enables the user more flexibility.

Thus, claim 1 is patentable over Nguyen.

Independent claim 8, as amended, recites "a system for providing compatible program language to said printer based upon a dynamically user-created character substitution table . . . ; and, a file system . . . , wherein the file system can include both printable characters and print commands." Independent claim 14, as amended, recites "a managing program for a user to create a character substitution table . . . , wherein the character substitution table can include both printable characters and print commands." Independent claim 19, as amended, recites "creating a user-changeable character substitution table . . . , wherein the program can include both printable characters and print commands." Thus, claims 8, 14, and 19 are patentable over Nguyen for reasons similar to claim 1 discussed above.

Claims 2, 3, 7, 9-11, 15, 16, 20, 21, and 23 depend on claims 1, 8, 14, and 19 and are thus patentable over Nguyen for at least the same reasons as claims 1, 8, 14, and 19.

MACPHERSON, KYOK-CHEN
& REED LLP
1762 TECHNOLOGY DRIVE
SUITE 215
SAN JOSE, CA 95110
(408) 592-7660
FAX (408) 592-9262

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Dependent claims 4-6, 12, 13, 17, 18, and 22 were rejected as being unpatentable over Nguyen et al. in view of Colletti (US 6,323,865). Colletti was cited by the Examiner for disclosing various limitations in the above dependent claims. However, Colletti does not remedy the deficiencies of Nguyen et al. as applied to claims 1, 8, 14, and 19 discussed above.

Accordingly, dependent claims 4-6, 12, 13, 17, 18, and 22 are patentable over the cited references for at least the same reasons as claims 1, 8, 14, and 19.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

MacPHERSON, KWOK, CHAN
& REID LLP
1762 TECHNOLOGY DRIVE
SUITE 225
SAN JOSE, CA 95110
(408) 252-7030
FAX (408) 392-8262

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant believes pending claims 1-23 are allowable, and a notice of allowance is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions regarding the application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned Attorney at (949) 752-7040.

Certification of Facsimile Transmission	
I hereby certify that this paper is being facsimile transmitted to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on the date shown below.	
 Monique M. Butler	June 21, 2005 Date of Signature

Respectfully submitted,



Tom Chen
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 42,406

MCPHERSON, KYOK COEN
& KED LLP
1762 TECHNOLOGY DRIVE
SUITE 226
SAN JOSE, CA 95110
(408) 593-9240
FAX (408) 593-9262